

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

MELISA JENRETT,

Plaintiff,

v.

CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:24-cv-00002-APG-NJK

ORDER

On November 7, 2023, Plaintiff initiated this suit in the Eighth Judicial District Court of Clark County, Nevada. Docket No. 1 at 6. On January 2, 2024, Defendant Kevin McPartlin removed the action to this Court. Docket No. 1. Defendant McPartlin was subsequently dismissed from this action and no other parties have entered an appearance in this matter. *See* Docket.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4 governs the issuance of summons and service of process. Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m) provides that:

If a defendant is not served within 90 days after the complaint is filed, the court – on motion or on its own after notice to the plaintiff – must dismiss the action without prejudice against that defendant or order that service be made within a specified time. But if the plaintiff shows good cause for the failure, the Court must extend the time for service for an appropriate period.

To date, there has been no proof of service filed as to Clark County School District, Sara Friedman, Paul Hernandez, or David Monroe.¹

Accordingly, Plaintiff is hereby **ORDERED** to provide proof of service by March 21, 2024, as to the above-named parties. Service on the parties must have taken place prior to the

¹ Defendant McPartlin's petition for removal states that "[u]pon information and belief, as of the filing of this Notice of Removal, no other Defendants listed by the Plaintiff in the caption of the Complaint have been served." Docket No. 1 at 2. Where any defendant has not been served with process or in which the service has not been perfected prior to removal, "such process may be completed or new process issued in the same manner as in cases originally filed" in this Court. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1448; *see also* *Beecher v. Wallace*, 381 F.2d 372, 373 (9th Cir. 1967).

1 expiration of the time limit set forth in Fed.R.Civ.P. 4(m), or good cause must be shown as to why
2 such service was not made in that period.

3 Failure to comply with this order may result in a recommendation of dismissal to the
4 District Judge as to said parties.

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: February 22, 2024

7
8 
9 _____
10 Nancy J. Koppe
11 United States Magistrate Judge
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28